

EDITOR'S NOTE

Late last Fall, after nearly all the plans had been laid and authors contacted for this issue of the *Ohio State Law Journal*, it was discovered that we were not the only ones planning an issue devoted to pre-trial procedure. Western Reserve had also chosen this subject. Since plans for both the Western Reserve and Ohio State symposia on pre-trial were well along, it was difficult for either to change topics. But, as Judge William H. Thomas of Cleveland has expressed it, "you can't write too much about pre-trial"; consequently, both *Reviews* determined to proceed. To all those who wish to read further about pre-trial, especially concerning its development in Cleveland, we recommend the forthcoming issue of the *Western Reserve Law Review*.

In this issue, the *Ohio State Law Journal* has attempted to approach the subject of pre-trial from as many different angles as possible. Our Foreword is by Judge Ira W. Jayne, the acknowledged originator of the system which eventually was tagged as the "pre-trial conference."

Following Judge Jayne's Foreword is an article by a distinguished Circuit Judge, Judge Clark of the 2nd Circuit.

The next article is by Harry J. Nims of New York City, the author of "Pre-Trial." We were quite pleased when the author of this authoritative volume consented to write on a significant recent development in pre-trial, that is, pre-trial immediately after issue is joined.

Turning to pre-trial in Ohio, the next article is by a well known Cleveland trial attorney, Burns Weston. Mr. Weston's article discusses the administration of pre-trial from the trial attorney's standpoint. Following Mr. Weston's article, Common Pleas Judge O. W. Whitney of Delaware County discusses his experience in the administration of pre-trial in one of the smaller Ohio counties.

The last article, by attorney Ross W. Shumaker of Toledo, contains some extremely interesting information concerning the past development and present status of the pre-trial conference in Ohio. Mr. Shumaker also raises some difficult questions concerning the proper objectives of the pre-trial conference.

One problem not specifically discussed in this symposium is that of whether Ohio should adopt a pre-trial statute, imposing such procedure on all the Ohio common pleas courts. It is the editor's opinion that we should wait and see, that we don't know enough about it yet. But we do hope that this issue of the *Journal* will at least raise the question, and perhaps furnish some of the answers to a problem which, we forecast, will eventually face the General Assembly.